

INFRARED PHOTOMETRY OF NGC 6791¹

Bruce W. Carney², Jae-Woo Lee³,

and

Benjamin Dodson²

ABSTRACT

We present deep JHK photometry of the old and metal-rich open cluster NGC 6791. The photometry reaches below the main sequence turn-off to $K \approx 16.5$ mag. We combine our photometry with that from Stetson, Bruntt, & Grundahl (2003) to provide color-magnitude diagrams showing K vs. $J - K$, K vs. $V - K$, and V vs. $V - K$. We study the slope of the red giant branch in the infrared, but find that it is not a useful metallicity indicator for the cluster, nor any metal-rich cluster that lacks a well-populated red giant branch, because it is not linear, as has often been assumed, in K vs. $J - K$. The mean color of the red horizontal branch/red clump stars provide an estimate the cluster reddening, $E(B - V) = 0.14 \pm 0.04$ mag for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.4 \pm 0.1$. The mean magnitudes of these stars also provide a good distance estimate, $(m - M)_0 = 13.07 \pm 0.04$. Finally, we find that the isochrones of Yi, Kim, & Demarque (2003) provide optimal fits in V vs. $B - V$ and $V - K$ and K vs. $J - K$ and $V - K$ for such values if $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ lies between $+0.3$ and $+0.5$ (with a slight preference for $+0.5$) and ages between 9 Gyrs ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.3$) and 7.5 Gyrs ($[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.5$).

Subject headings: Galaxy: disk — open clusters: individual (NGC 6791) — stars: abundances — infrared: stars

¹Based on observations made with the Mayall 4-meter telescope of the National Optical Astronomy Observatory

²Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3255; bruce@physics.unc.edu; benjadod@email.unc.edu

³Department of Astronomy & Space Science, Astrophysical Research Center for the Structure and Evolution of the Cosmos, Sejong University, 98 Gunja-Dong, Gwangjin-Gu, Seoul, 143-747; jae-woo@arcsec.sejong.ac.kr

1. INTRODUCTION

NGC 6791 is a remarkable star cluster. It is one of the very few known open clusters whose age approaches that of globular clusters and the halo generally, with recent age estimates ranging from 8 Gyrs (Chaboyer, Green, & Liebert 1999) to 10 Gyrs (Tripicco et al. 1995) to 12 Gyrs (Stetson, Bruntt, & Grundahl 2003; hereafter SBG2003). The cluster is therefore a rare fossil find, and is one of the few samples where we can study stars that formed very early in the evolution of the Galaxy’s disk. Despite its age, its heavy elements appear to be more abundant than in the much younger Sun and comparable age stars and clusters at the solar Galactocentric distance.

The abundances are difficult to measure in this moderately distant and moderately extinguished cluster, and metallicity estimates or measures have been provided using three general methods, all of them summarized well by SBG2003. Metallicity “indicators” are so named because they must be calibrated using other clusters or stars whose abundances have been measured using high-resolution spectroscopy. Canterna et al. (1986), using Washington system photometry, and Friel & Janes (1993), using *DDO* photometry, pointed the way to a “super-solar metallicity” for NGC 6791. Low- and moderate-resolution spectroscopy, likewise calibrated using stars whose abundances have been determined using high-resolution spectroscopy, have also implied high metallicities (Friel et al. 20002; Worthey & Jowett 2003; see also Cole et al. 2004). The model isochrones employed to derive estimates of the cluster’s age may also help estimate the cluster’s chemical composition, although the problem is then multi-parametric. Chaboyer et al. (1999) and SBG2003 have both used this approach to infer heavy element mass fractions of at least twice solar. The most direct method to determine the cluster’s chemical composition is, of course, high-resolution spectroscopy. This is not as simple as it sounds. The cluster is relatively distant, with $(m - M)_0$ estimates ranging from 12.6 to 13.6 (!). Thus even its most luminous stars are relatively faint. However, such stars are also quite cool, and the combination of low effective temperature and high metallicity conspire to make such spectra difficult to evaluate. This is (partly) what led Peterson & Green (1998) to study star 2-17, which is apparently a cluster member, despite being a “blue horizontal branch” star; that is, a fairly hot star with a rather thin hydrogen envelope and a hydrogen-burning shell above a helium-burning core. The existence of such stars in NCG 6791 adds spice to an already sumptuous cluster, and also show that the metallicity is indeed very high, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \approx +0.4 \pm 0.1$. The cluster’s reddening estimates are also somewhat uncertain, but a careful study of field stars in the direction of the cluster revealed $E(B - V) = 0.10 \pm 0.02$ (Montgomery, Janes, & Phelps 1994). Taylor (2001) has critically reviewed the metallicity estimates and concluded that $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ most probably lies in the range of +0.16 to +0.44.

So NGC 6791 truly is remarkable: it somehow formed long before the Sun, and not too long after the onset of star formation had begun in the Galactic disk, yet its star-forming environment had already produced twice as many heavy elements per unit mass as had the environment out of which the Sun and similar stars formed several billion years later. For this reason alone, NGC 6791 deserves extensive study.

There is a second reason for an observational focus on NGC 6791. Because it is both old and metal-rich, it can play a critical role in calibrating the diverse “secondary” metallicity indicators, such as low- to moderate-resolution spectroscopy or photometry.

We argue that infrared photometry of the cluster can add valuable information. The slope of the red giant branch in K vs. $J - K$ is reddening- and distance-independent, yet has been shown to be a metallicity indicator [Kuchinski et al. (1995); Kuchinski & Frogel (1995); Ferraro et al. (2000); Ivanov & Borissova (2002); Valenti, Ferraro, and Origlia (2004a; hereafter VFO); Valenti et al. 2004b]. Metal-rich globular clusters also appear to have de-reddened mean colors of their red horizontal branch stars that are insensitive to metallicity, and claims have also been made that their mean K -band luminosities do not depend strongly on metallicity (Kuchinski et al. 1995; Kuchinski & Frogel 1995; but see Grocholski & Sarajedini 2002). Thus such stars in NGC 6791 may provide independent reddening and distance estimates. Infrared colors such as $(J - K)$ are less affected by line blanketing and hence show reduced sensitivity to metallicity than optical colors. (See Alonso, Arribas, & Martinez-Roger 1996 for a discussion of color-temperature relations for main sequence stars, and Alonso, Arribas, & Martinez 1999 for a similar discussion of giant stars). Finally, the combination of optical and infrared photometry provides very long wavelength baselines and colors that have special sensitivity to temperature independent of metallicity, such as $V - K$.

2. OBSERVATIONS & DATA REDUCTIONS

NGC 6791 was observed on the night of June 15-16, 1997 using the Kitt Peak National Observatory 4-meter Mayall telescope and the IRIM camera. IRIM contained a 256×256 pixels HgCdTe NICMOS3 detector, with an image scale of roughly $0.6'' \text{ pixel}^{-1}$, and a field of view of $154'' \times 154''$. The night was clear throughout, with the full width at half maximum image quality ranged from $0.8''$ to $1.0''$.

The HgCdTe detector was operated with a gain setting of 10.46 electrons per ADU, and the full well capacity was equivalent to about 400,000 electrons. The readnoise was 35 electrons, and the typical dark level was 2 electrons (not discernable at our gain setting). The device was non-linear for the brightest objects, the effect size reaching about 6% at 350,000

electrons. We calibrated the non-linearity pixel-by-pixel by taking a lengthy series of dome flats. Exposures of 1, 3, 1, 10, 1, 15, 1, 20, 1, 30, and 1 seconds were taken through the J filter. The interspersed 1-sec frames enabled us to monitor any changes in the calibration lamp illumination. Dark frames were also taken every day at all the exposure times employed for the observing run. (See Lee & Carney 2002 for additional discussion of the corrections for non-linearity, especially their Figure 1.)

The cluster was observed using 0.5, 1.0, and 10-second integration times, with each recorded image resulting from the co-addition of two such observations. For each pointing of the telescope, a five-position raster pattern was employed to dither the images on $5''$ scales. This was done primarily to produce a smoother sky background, which dominates the photometric precision for most of our program stars. Two such rasters were done at each pointing, yielding a set of images for each field with a cumulative exposure time of 200 seconds. After each cluster field had been observed, a single set of 5-position rasters was made of a field in a region of lower stellar density to improve the sky background measurement.

Five cluster fields were observed. One was centered on the cluster's central position. Each of the remaining four fields were offset by roughly $75''$ in both right ascension and declination in the northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest directions. Thus all four offset fields overlapped different quadrants of the cluster central field, enabling us to better register the images to a common grid, and to provide somewhat improved observations for the central field since this observation pattern effectively doubled the integration time for all of the central stars.

Seven standard stars were observed during the night, with one of them followed from airmass 1.2 to 2.0 to determine the atmospheric extinction. The standard stars were taken from the list of faint JHK standard stars for UKIRT (Casali & Hawarden 1992), and ranged from 9.76 to 13.12 in K , and had a good range in color, $J - K = -0.09$ to $+0.62$ mag. All standard stars were analyzed using the PHOTOMETRY task in DAOPHOTII (Stetson 1995). With the results of aperture photometry, a growth curve analysis was performed using DAOGROW (Stetson 1990) to obtain integrated magnitudes. The first-order K passband extinction term k_k is $0.077 \text{ mag air mass}^{-1}$ and the first-order color extinction terms k'_{jk} and k'_{jh} are -0.003 and $0.039 \text{ mag air mass}^{-1}$, respectively.

To calibrate the photometry, the photometric transformations were assumed to have the following form.

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\text{UKIRT}} &= k_0 + \zeta_K, \\ (J - K)_{\text{UKIRT}} &= \mu(j - k)_0 + \zeta_{J-K}, \\ (J - H)_{\text{UKIRT}} &= \epsilon(j - h)_0 + \zeta_{J-H}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The transformation coefficients are $\zeta_K = -3.285 \pm 0.009$, $\mu = 1.024 \pm 0.018$, $\zeta_{J-K} = 0.626 \pm 0.009$, $\epsilon = 0.983 \pm 0.016$, and $\zeta_{J-H} = 0.115 \pm 0.004$ in the UKIRT JHK system, where the errors are those of the mean.

Point-spread function (PSF) photometry for all NGC 6791 frames was performed using DAOPHOTII and ALLSTAR/ALLFRAME (Stetson 1987, 1994, 1995; Turner 1995). We applied aperture corrections, air-mass corrections, and the above photometric transformations to the PSF magnitudes returned from our ALLFRAME run. Finally, we converted our UKIRT JHK magnitudes to the CIT JHK magnitudes using the following transformation equations given by Casali & Hawarden (1992):

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\text{CIT}} &= K_{\text{UKIRT}} - 0.018(J - K)_{\text{UKIRT}}, \\ (J - K)_{\text{CIT}} &= 0.936(J - K)_{\text{UKIRT}}, \\ (H - K)_{\text{CIT}} &= 0.960(H - K)_{\text{UKIRT}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

3. RESULTS

3.1. The Infrared Color-magnitude diagram

Figure 1 shows the results of our observations. The red giant branch, red horizontal branch, subgiant branch, and even main sequence turn-off are clearly discernible. Data for individual stars are given in Table 1. Positions for these stars are taken from SBG2003.

3.2. Comparison of 2MASS Photometry with Our Results

Excluding stars near the edges of our frames, we are able to match 149 stars in the 2MASS survey with stars for which we have been able to measure JHK magnitudes and colors. This includes only 2MASS stars with the highest quality photometry (“AAA” photometry quality flags). We have used the recommended transformations between the 2MASS and CIT photometric systems (Carpenter 2001), and in Figures 2, 3, and 4 we show the differences (in the sense our results minus those from 2MASS) between the K magnitudes and $J - K$ and $H - K$ colors for the brighter stars, those with $K \leq 13.6$ mag. The weighted mean difference in K is -0.014 ± 0.005 mag, with no dependence on K magnitude. Likewise, there is no significant correlation in the differences in the $J - K$ colors with the colors themselves, and the weighted average difference between our values and those from 2MASS is only $+0.007 \pm 0.005$ mag. In the case of $H - K$, however, there is a correlation between $\Delta(H - K)$ and $H - K$ (the correlation coefficient is 0.68). The overall effect is modest, and the mean

difference in $H - K$ is only -0.021 ± 0.007 mag. We do not believe the problem arises in the H filter we employed, nor in our photometric data reductions since the transformations appear to be good between the instrumental system and the UKIRT standard stars. However, we note that the equations derived by Carpenter (2001) for transforming UKIRT and CIT photometry into the 2MASS system may be employed to derive the following CIT-to-UKIRT relations:

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\text{CIT}} &= K_{\text{UKIRT}} + 0.004(J - K)_{\text{UKIRT}} - 0.026, \\ (J - K)_{\text{CIT}} &= 1.012(J - K)_{\text{UKIRT}} + 0.001, \\ (H - K)_{\text{CIT}} &= 1.035(H - K)_{\text{UKIRT}} + 0.045. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

These do not agree particularly well with the relations derived by Casali & Hawarden (1992; Equation 1). The relatively good agreement between our K and $J - K$ results and those from 2MASS, and the disagreement for the $H - K$ results suggests that the transformations between the various photometric systems remain a source of some uncertainties.

3.3. Matching to Optical Photometry

The very extensive BVI photometry of SBG2003 was employed to obtain optical photometry for our program stars. The transformation of (x,y) positions in the superposed image of the cluster began with identification of sixteen of the brighter stars in the 2MASS survey, and a pair of third-order polynomial equations to transform (x,y) to right ascension and declination. The rms error of the fits were of order $0.2''$. The superposition of the five fields was not perfect, and only about half of the 150 or so 2MASS stars were identified by this process. A similar procedure was employed for sixteen of the brighter remaining 2MASS stars. The rms error in positions was roughly $0.1''$ for this case. We thus were forced to employ two possible coordinate transformations for all of our program stars.

We then applied both transformations to compute the estimated right ascensions and declinations for all of our program stars. A match to a star from SBG2003 was declared only if the separation was less than $3''$. In the case of multiple matches, only the nearest star was selected for each transformation.

Nonetheless, some of our program stars had matches using both transformations. To select the star that provides a better match, we then compared $J - K$ color indices from our work with the V magnitude from SBG2003 and the K magnitude from our work. A simple linear relation was fit to the $J - K$ vs. $V - K$ color indices, and 3σ outliers were rejected. A new iteration was undertaken with the remaining stars, and multiple iterations were employed until the relation showed no significant change from one iteration to the next.

At that point the empirical $J - K$ vs. $V - K$ relation was employed to select the better match when both position transformations found matches. We then eliminated stars that deviated by more than 1.0 mag in $V - K$ from that predicted by our $J - K$ photometry.

Our final results, given in Table 1, include the positions for each star from RBG2003, the V , $B - V$, and $V - I$ photometry, also from SBG2003, and our own results, J , H , K , as well as $J - K$ and $V - K$, and their associated errors.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. The Slope of the Red Giant Branch

4.1.1. Calibration of the relation between the slope and $[Fe/H]$

The slope and color of the red giant branch have both been used for decades to infer the mean metallicity of globular clusters from optical color-magnitude diagrams. Zinn & West (1984) and Zinn (1985) discussed the earlier work thoroughly, and Sarajedini (1994) showed how the reddening-insensitive slope and the reddening-dependent color of a BV color-magnitude diagram could be used to infer the cluster metallicity and the reddening simultaneously. Sarajedini & Layden (1997) extended this to VI color-magnitude diagrams. Kuchinski et al. (1995) and Kuchinski & Frogel (1995) demonstrated that the slope of the red giant branch in a K vs. $J - K$ color-magnitude diagram could also be employed as a metallicity indicator, but also argued that the color of the red giant branch is not particularly sensitive to reddening for metallicities in the range $-1.0 \leq [Fe/H] \leq -0.3$, diminishing the possibility of measuring both $[Fe/H]$ and $E(J - K)$ simultaneously.

Kuchinski et al. (1995) recommended simple linear fits to determine the slope since, unlike optical photometry, the red giant branches do not show any significant curvature above the level of the horizontal branch. They recommended using stars lying between 0.6 and 5.1 magnitudes above the level of the red horizontal branch, the bright limit being set by the desire to avoid possible photometric variable stars near the luminous tip of the red giant branch. Valenti et al. (2004b) and VFO have re-calibrated the relationship between the slope, defined by $\Delta(J - K)/\Delta K$, and $[Fe/H]$. They noted that reliance on the magnitude level of the horizontal branch to define a reference point compromises the method prescribed by Kuchinski et al. (1995) since some clusters do not have red horizontal branch stars. Since the “horizontal branch” is not horizontal in a K vs. $J - K$ diagram, clusters with predominantly blue horizontal branches would be more difficult to exploit within the above magnitude limit prescription. Valenti et al. (2004b) and VFO therefore recommended that the slope be simply

defined using stars 0.5 and 5.0 magnitudes fainter than the most luminous red giant branch star. We point out the obvious fact that in the case of a linear fit to a linear set of data will yield exactly the same answer, so either set of measured slopes should, in principle, suit equally well. We show below, however, that the RGB slope does not appear to be linear.

Both Valenti et al. (2004b) and VFO also compared the slope with $[M/H]$, the “mean metallicity” of the cluster. This is meant to include the contributions of elements other than those of the iron peak, the abundance of light elements in particular. The logic of such a calibration is that model isochrones depend on the heavy element mass fraction, Z , and results are also often available for different mixes of the “ α ” elements (O, Mg, Ca, Si, and in some cases Ti). Indeed, isochrones that are distinguished only by Z and not by $[\alpha/Fe]$ may still be compared using an expression relating them to $[Fe/H]$ (see Straniero & Chieffi 1991 and Salaris, Chieffi, & Straniero 1993 for details). The most inclusive calibration between $[M/H]$ and the slope of the red giant branch is that given by VFO. We are reluctant to employ such a calibration for NGC 6791 or, indeed, the most heavily extinguished globular clusters for which observations are now underway, because systematic differences between $[\alpha/Fe]$ at fixed $[Fe/H]$ do exist to a small degree among field halo stars (King 1997; Carney et al. 1997; Nissen & Schuster 1997), in a few globular clusters (Brown, Wallerstein, & Zucker 1997; Cohen 2004), and in stars in the Galactic bulge (McWilliam & Rich 1994). The differences are even stronger in neighboring dwarf galaxies with predominantly old populations such as Draco and Ursa Minor (Shetrone, Côté, & Sargent 2001) and Sculptor (Shetrone et al. 2003), where low $[\alpha/Fe]$ ratios are found even at very low metallicities. Comparisons with model isochrones using $[M/H]$ or $[Fe/H]$ and variable $[\alpha/Fe]$ values are useful in an exploratory sense, as we do below, but the most reliable comparisons can be made only once high-resolution spectroscopy has provided as detailed an elemental abundance profile as possible.

VFO also derived a relationship between the slope of the red giant branch and $[Fe/H]$, and we reproduce their equation A41 here:

$$[Fe/H]_{CG97} = -22.21(slope_{RGB}) - 2.80. \quad (4)$$

Note that the metallicity scale they employed was that of Carretta & Gratton (1997), which differs slightly from that employed by Zinn (1985). VFO also noted that this relation disagrees significantly with that derived by Ivanov & Borissova (2002). VFO attributed the difference to the less extensive set of data available to Ivanov & Borissova (2002) and to an inaccurate measurement of the red giant branch slope for 47 Tuc, their most metal-rich cluster.

We employ here the $[Fe/H]$ metallicity scale adopted by Zinn (1985). While yet another calibration of the relationship between the red giant branch slope and $[Fe/H]$ may be of limited value, we believe such a calibration has merit. The Carretta & Gratton (1997)

metallicity scale is not as widely applicable to other clusters as those of Zinn (1985). Indeed, excluding the multi-metallicity cluster ω Cen, use of the results from Zinn (1985) increases the sample size from 23 to 28 clusters, and is capable of growing much larger still using an internally consistent metallicity scale as new *JHK* observations of clusters become available. We collect in Table 2 the available data, relying primarily on VFO for the data for the red giant branch slopes, and the $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values from Zinn (1985). Use of an ordinary least squares bissector to the data, assuming $\sigma([\text{Fe}/\text{H}]) \approx 0.2$ for most clusters, results in:

$$[Fe/H]_{Zinn} = -27.95(\pm 2.26)(slope_{RGB}) - 3.35(\pm 0.19). \quad (5)$$

Figure 5 shows our results. Please note that the open circle represents our own results (Lee, Carney, & Balachandran 2004) for Palomar 6, a cluster so heavily extinguished that it is most readily studied photometrically *and* spectroscopically only at infrared wavelengths.

4.1.2. Results for NGC 6791

As discussed in the Introduction, NGC 6791 is thought to have a very high metallicity, $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \approx +0.3$. Extrapolation of Equations 4 and 5 to such a metallicity predict red giant branch slopes of -0.14 and -0.13 , respectively. If the uncertainty in the slope of either relation is about 8%, as implied in Equation 5, then these predicted slopes have uncertainties of about ± 0.01 .

NGC 6791 is a relatively sparse cluster, and coupled with the relatively small area we have surveyed, there are too few stars at or above the magnitude level of the horizontal branch to employ the full 4 to 5 magnitude range recommended by either Kuchinski et al. (1995) or VFO. But only the precision of the slope is compromised by a more limited range, not the value itself, *so long as the data are indeed well-defined by a linear fit*. Because our results for the slope are not consistent with the predictions, we derive them here using three different approaches.

First, to increase the number of stars and, we hope, improve the precision of our measure, we extend the fitting region below the horizontal branch. Figure 6 shows the resultant slope and the stars employed to determine the fit (filled circles). We have again employed an ordinary least squares bissector fitting routine. The slope in this case is -0.088 ± 0.005 , which differs considerably from what is expected. In fact, both Equations 4 and 5 then predict $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -0.9 \pm 0.1$.

Second, we restrict the measurement of the slope to only the nine brightest red giants in Figure 6, avoiding the problem of possible non-linear behavior for stars fainter than the horizontal branch. In this case, the slope becomes -0.092 ± 0.013 , implying $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] =$

-0.8 ± 0.3 . The implied very low metallicity is confirmed. The dashed line shows roughly what the slope should be if we use Equation 5, with the intersection between the two relations forced to lie at the magnitude level of the horizontal branch. It is very clear that our data yield a red giant branch slope that is inconsistent with a metallicity greater than solar, if Equations 4 or 5 are extrapolated into higher metallicity regions than the clusters that have been used to calibrate both relations.

Finally, we derive slope using the results from the 2MASS survey, independent of our own photometry. We do not expect different answers since, as we have seen, the 2MASS photometry is very consistent with our data once minor zero point offsets are taken into account. In Figures 7, 8, and 9 we show the results from 2MASS. Figure 7 shows the “field” in the vicinity of NGC 6791, and includes stars in four fields $15'$ north, south, east, and west of the cluster center. Each field has a radius of $3'$. These were selected to crudely sample possible variations in interstellar reddening (see below) and provide a sample size roughly consistent with that of Figure 8, which was centered on the cluster and also has a radius of $3'$. The filled circles in Figure 8 represent the 8 stars used for the fit, which yielded a red giant branch slope of -0.084 ± 0.009 . Figure 9 repeats the analysis, but includes a radius of $4'$ around the cluster center, and a fit to the 11 stars marked as filled circles, which yielded a slope of -0.083 ± 0.007 . Figures 8 and 9, coupled with Equations 4 and 5 all lead to $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ estimates that range from -0.9 to -1.0 , each with an uncertainty of about ± 0.2 dex. The 2MASS results thus independently confirm that *the slope of the red giant branch in NGC 6791 is not consistent with the calibrations of Equation 4 and 5 and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values anywhere near solar*. Something is wrong.

How can we reconcile the differences between the spectroscopic estimates of the high metallicity for NGC 6791 and the much lower value implied by the slope of the red giant branch? There are basically six options.

1. Our photometry is in error. This also seems unlikely, since our results agree so well with 2MASS, and we feel that our observations were obtained under excellent observing conditions, and optimized to remove any possible detector non-linearities.
2. The cluster’s metallicity is, in fact, very low. This likewise seems implausible since the spectroscopic evidence for such a high metallicity is compelling.
3. NGC 6791 may mimic a lower metallicity cluster if the dominant electron donors in the stellar atmospheres are underabundant relative to the calibrating clusters. This would include the α elements such as Ca and Mg, in particular. This is in apparent conflict with the results of Peterson & Green (1998).

4. We have too few stars to reliably measure the slope of the red giant branch. While the number of stars is small, the slope does appear to be well-measured.
5. The slope of the red giant branch is a linear function of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, as indicated in Figure 5, but only if $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \leq -0.3$.
6. Finally, the claim that the slope of the red giant branch is linear in K vs. $J - K$ may be incorrect.

We explore the latter two points using the isochrones of Yi, Kim, & Demarque (2003; hereafter YKD2003) and the color-temperature relations of Alonso et al. (1999). Figure 10 shows the predicted values of M_K vs. $J - K$ for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values ranging from -0.8 to $+0.3$. Overall, it appears that the color of the red giant branch continues to depend on $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ up to the metallicity comparable to that of NGC 6791. However, the slope of the red giant branch at any fixed metallicity is *not* predicted to be linear above $M_K = -1.5$, a value typical of the red horizontal branch or red clump stars. Curvature in the M_K vs. $J - K$ plane is clearly present at each metallicity shown. While linear approximations of the slope may yet prove useful, the Figure shows that any such measure must employ consistently defined and employed reference points. Nonetheless, the slope of the red giant branch does appear to still be a good reddening-insensitive metallicity indicator, although it appears that a new calibration will be required so that it may be applied to sparse clusters, such as NGC 6791, whose red giants do not extend more than about two magnitudes above the red horizontal branch/red clump domain.

4.2. Cluster Reddening

NGC 6791 lies at a relatively high Galactic latitude ($b \approx 10.9$ deg), so the reddening is not expected to be high, as discussed in detail by SBG2003. The compilation of Twarog, Ashman, & Anthony-Twarog (1997) suggests $E(B - V)$ is 0.15 mag, while SBG2003 adopted 0.09 mag, and Montgomery et al. (1994) found a value of 0.10 ± 0.02 mag using field stars in the cluster's vicinity.

Our photometry may be used to explore this issue, following the suggestions of Kuchinski et al. (1995) and Kuchinski & Frogel (1995) that the mean color of the red horizontal branch for globular clusters with $-1.0 \leq [\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \leq -0.3$ is insensitive to metallicity.

We revisit this issue here. We confine our attention to only the oldest clusters: those with estimated ages exceeding 2.5×10^9 years. This includes only three open clusters (Be 39, NGC 6791, and NGC 6819) from Grocholski & Sarajedini (2002), plus their globular

clusters 47 Tuc, NGC 362, and the globular clusters NGC 5927, NGC 6624, NGC 6637, NGC 6712, and NGC 6838 (M71) from Kuchinski & Frogel (1995). (We exclude the most heavily extinguished clusters Liller 1, Terzan 2, and NGC 6440.) Before presenting our results, we felt it necessary to repeat the color estimations done by Grocholski & Sarajedini (2002), since it appeared from their figures that their results may have been compromised by including stars on the red giant branch. We show in Figures 11 and 12 the 2MASS K vs. $J - K$ data for these clusters, with the red horizontal branch/red clump stars identified as open circles. The mean colors were computed and transformed to the CIT photometric system (Carpenter 2001), and our results are given in Table 3.

Figure 13 somewhat confirms the speculation of Kuchinski & Frogel (1995), which is hardly suprising since we are employing their data for the clusters with $-1.0 \leq [\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \leq -0.3$. But the Figure also shows that inclusion of more metal-poor and more metal-rich clusters shows that there is indeed a fairly strong metallicity sensitivity! If we fit the data using an ordinary least squares bissector, we find

$$\langle J - K \rangle_0 = (0.170 \pm 0.026)[Fe/H] + (0.596 \pm 0.016). \quad (6)$$

The fifteen stars identified as red horizontal branch stars in Figure 6 yield $\langle J - K \rangle = 0.73 \pm 0.01$. If we accept that $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.4 \pm 0.1$ (Peterson & Green 1998), we find that $E(J - K) = 0.075 \pm 0.02$. Employing the interstellar extinction law measured by Rieke & Lebofsky (1985), we find $E(B - V) = 0.14 \pm 0.04$. This is consistent with previous cluster estimates. Indeed, the estimate of Montgomery et al. (1994) of 0.10 ± 0.02 would, notionally, support a metallicity for the cluster a bit higher than +0.4.

4.3. Cluster Distance

The luminosity of the horizontal branch has been an extremely useful (and disputed) tool for the estimation of cluster distances for decades. Since the infrared magnitudes are less vulnerable to reddening and extinction, $M_K(\text{RHB})$ has attracted some special attention. Kuchinski et al. (1995) and Kuchinski & Frogel (1995) helped pioneer this area of study as well, noting that the intermediate metallicity clusters had comparable $M_K(\text{RHB})$ values. Alves (2000) combined *Hipparcos* parallaxes, K -band photometry, and spectroscopic metallicity estimates for over two hundred field red clump stars, almost all with $-0.6 \leq [\text{Fe}/\text{H}] \leq +0.1$. The peak in the luminosity distribution was found to lie at $M_K \approx -1.61 \pm 0.03$, and Alves (2000) argued that there is no sensitivity to metallicity, at least over the range studied, making the tool particularly powerful for metal-rich clusters, and supporting the earlier results of Kuchinski et al. (1995) and Kuchinski & Frogel (1995). We note that apparently

not all of the stars studied by Alves (2000) are horizontal branch or red clump stars since the dispersion in the derived M_K value is much too large. But the median value appears reliable, and, in fact, Grocholski & Sarajedini (2002) derived a remarkably similar value, $M_K = -1.62 \pm 0.06$, using open clusters. Age may also play a role, and ages for the field stars employed by Alves (2000) are unknown. Grocholski & Sarajedini (2002) explored this issue as well, employing a consistent set of distance, reddening, and metallicity estimation procedures for a sample of open and globular clusters. They found that clusters with ages greater than about 2 Gyrs did not show significant variation in $M_K(\text{RHB})$ with age, but that there is some sensitivity to metallicity. (Conversely, younger clusters' red clump stars' luminosities were not so dependent on metallicity, but were sensitive to age differences.) Finally, Pietrzyński, & Udalski (2003) compared K -band red clump luminosities derived for stars in four Local Group galaxies with distances estimated from the the red giant branch tip I -band magnitudes, V -band RR Lyrae luminosities, and K -band cepheid observations. They agreed with Gocholski & Sarajedini (2000) that the K -band luminosity of red clump stars has “very little (if any) dependence on age over an age range of about 2-8 Gyrs”. They similarly found little sensitivity to metallicity, although their metallicity range was roughly from -0.5 down to -1.8 , well out the regime of interest in terms of a distance estimate for NGC 6791.

The value of $\langle K \rangle$ for the fifteen red horizontal branch stars in NGC 6791 is 11.50 ± 0.03 , and differences in $E(B - V)$ of 0.05 mag alter the calculation of $\langle K_0 \rangle$ by only 0.01 mag. Using the calibration of Alves (2000), we therefore derive a distance modulus of $(m - M)_0 = 13.07 \pm 0.04$.

5. THE AGE OF NGC 6791

The color index $V - K$ provides a very powerful indicator of effective temperature in stars, and its relationship to T_{eff} and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ for dwarfs and giants has been described by Alonso et al. (1996, 1999), respectively. In brief, the wide wavelength span enables high sensitivity, roughly 20 K per 0.01 mag, or better. The metallicity sensitivity is also weak, at least until temperatures are cool enough or metallicities are high enough for TiO bands to cause significant absorption in the V bandpass.

Figures 14 and 15 show the combined optical and infrared photometry for our sample of stars using the $V - K$ color index and the K and V magnitudes, respectively. The effects of TiO absorption in the V bandpass are apparent. In Figure 14 the shape of the cooler part of the red giant branch has a noticeable change of slope, compared to the near-linear behavior seen in the K vs. $J - K$ diagram shown in Figure 1. In Figure 15, where we compare V

vs. $V - K$, the effect is even stronger. Optical color indices such as $B - V$ and $V - I$, with shorter wavelength baselines, coupled with the V bandpass, are therefore not as suitable for thoroughly testing observations with the predictions of model isochrones.

We have relied on the grid of model isochrones computed by YKD2003, and the transformation of luminosity into M_V and M_K and effective temperature into $B - V$, $J - K$, and $V - K$ that they employed. Because our infrared data are on a slightly different photometric system, we employed the transformations recommended by Bessell & Brett (1998). Because good empirical color-temperature transformations exist only for solar-metallicity stars with $[\alpha/\text{Fe}] \approx 0.0$, we chose to employ only those isochrones with a solar mix of heavy elements.

Figure 16 shows fits in the four color-magnitude diagram planes for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = 0.0$, using parameters selected according to the criterion that a “best fit” be obtained in the V vs. $B - V$ plane. Note that the implied reddening, $E(B - V) = 0.26$ mag, and distance modulus, $(m - M)_0 = 12.73$, are not in good agreement with the estimates presented above. Note also that while the match is very good in the optical, the matches in the infrared are, frankly, unacceptable, due primarily to the large reddening value we had to adopt. (The unusual “hook” behavior seen in the V vs. $B - V$ plane near the tip of the red giant branch arises from line blanketing produced by molecular absorption, especially by TiO. The optical spectra of cooler, more metal-rich stars are affected especially. The Figure illustrates that near-infrared spectra and photometry are affected much less strongly.)

Figure 17 shows one of the best matches for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.3$, $E(B - V) = 0.17$ mag, $(m - M)_0 = 12.93$, and an age of 8.0 Gyrs. A slightly higher extinction (0.21 mag) leads to $(m - M)_0 = 13.00$ mag, and an age of 6.0 Gyrs, but the fit is slightly poorer. Increasing $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ to +0.4, the value recommended by Peterson & Green (1998), leads to Figure 18, with an optimum optical fit being obtained for $E(B - V) = 0.13$ mag, $(m - M)_0 = 12.96$ and an age of 8 Gyrs. Now the agreement with the estimated reddening and distance modulus is even better, and the agreement for all the color-magnitude diagrams with the isochrones is quite good.

The best match to the empirical reddening and distance estimates and the best matches to color-magnitude diagrams is shown in Figure 19, for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.5$, $E(B - V) = 0.11$ mag, $(m - M)_0 = 13.11$ mag, and an age of 7.5 Gyrs. The agreement of the reddening and the distance modulus to the empirically-derived values discussed in Sections 5.2 and 5.3 is excellent. Adopting $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.5$ leads to empirically-calibrated values for $E(B - V)$ of 0.09 mag and $(m - M)_0 = 13.07$ mag. We note that this metallicity is slightly higher than derived by Peterson & Green (1998), but is within the uncertainty, and may be accounted for by our use of $[\alpha/\text{Fe}] = 0.0$, while a value of +0.1 may be more appropriate.

While there are uncertainties in all of our estimates, including the reddening, the distance modulus, and in the procedure of fitting model isochrones to the optical and infrared color-magnitude diagrams, we are very encouraged by the consistency of the results for the relatively high $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values of +0.4 and +0.5, from which we conclude that the isochrones are most consistent with a cluster age of roughly 8 Gyrs.

6. SUMMARY

We have obtained relatively deep JHK photometry of the very old, very metal-rich open cluster NGC 6791. We have derived a revised relationship between the slope of the red giant branch and the metallicities of clusters using the Zinn (1985) calibrations. However, the slope of the RGB in NGC 6791 yields an unrealistically low metallicity because the cluster RGB is not well populated and the RGB itself is not expected to be linear, even in the K vs. $J - K$ plane. The mean color of the red horizontal branch stars implies $E(B - V) = 0.14 \pm 0.04$ mag, while the mean K magnitude is consistent with $(m - M)_0 \approx 13.07$. Both of these values produce very good agreement between optical and infrared color-magnitude diagrams for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values of +0.4 or +0.5. The optimal matches are found for a cluster age of roughly 8 Gyrs. Lower metallicities yield poorer agreements between the color-magnitude diagrams and model isochrones.

JWL thanks Y. -C. Kim for his kind discussion and acknowledges the financial support of the Korea Science and Engineering Foundation (KOSEF) to the Astrophysical Research Center for the Structure and Evolution of the Cosmos (ARCSEC). BWC acknowledges the financial support of the National Science Foundation to the University of North Carolina through grants AST-9619381, AST-9988156, and AST-0305431.

Table 1. Results of *JHK* Photometry & Matching to Optical Photometry

Id	Right ascension Declination	<i>V</i> σ	<i>B</i> − <i>V</i> σ	<i>V</i> − <i>I</i> σ	<i>J</i> σ	<i>H</i> σ	<i>K</i> σ	<i>J</i> − <i>K</i> σ	<i>V</i> − <i>K</i> σ
10099	19 20 58.65	12.155	2.348	0.569	9.658	9.064	8.668	0.990	3.487
	37 47 40.8	0.047	0.224	0.086	0.075	0.058	0.051	0.091	0.070
8904	19 20 55.11	13.862	1.633	1.970	10.582	9.780	9.598	0.984	4.264
	37 47 16.5	0.000	0.002	0.001	0.029	0.028	0.018	0.034	0.018
8266	19 20 53.39	13.741	1.616	1.779	10.775	10.024	9.770	1.005	3.971
	37 48 28.4	0.000	0.002	0.001	0.058	0.054	0.037	0.069	0.037
11814	19 21 4.27	13.849	1.575	1.658	11.060	10.304	10.128	0.932	3.721
	37 47 18.9	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.049	0.049	0.029	0.057	0.029
7972	19 20 52.60	14.136	1.593	1.763	11.160	10.445	10.208	0.952	3.928
	37 44 28.5	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.050	0.047	0.032	0.059	0.032
7063	19 20 50.04	13.061	1.081	1.249	10.927	10.356	10.259	0.668	2.802
	37 47 28.4	0.004	0.006	0.005	0.031	0.028	0.018	0.036	0.019
5342	19 20 44.86	14.138	1.569	1.749	11.203	10.463	10.298	0.905	3.840
	37 46 21.7	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.046	0.043	0.029	0.054	0.029
7328	19 20 50.78	13.599	0.869	1.259	11.618	11.119	11.006	0.612	2.593
	37 46 33.8	0.000	0.003	0.001	0.042	0.036	0.025	0.049	0.025

Table 2. Calibrating Clusters for the Relation Between $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ and the Slope of the Red Giant Branch

Cluster	$[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]^{\text{a}}$	Slope	σ	Reference ^b
NGC 104 (47 Tuc)	-0.71	-0.110	0.002	1
NGC 288	-1.40	-0.071	0.004	1
NGC 362	-1.28	-0.074	0.003	1
NGC 4590 (M68)	-2.09	-0.048	0.003	1
NGC 5272 (M3)	-1.66	-0.071	0.003	1
NGC 5904 (M5)	-1.40	-0.082	0.004	1
NGC 5927	-0.30	-0.112	0.005	2
NGC 6121 (M4)	-1.28	-0.079	0.009	1
NGC 6171 (M107)	-0.99	-0.101	0.005	1
NGC 6205 (M13)	-1.65	-0.065	0.002	1
NGC 6254 (M10)	-1.60	-0.048	0.005	1
NGC 6341 (M92)	-2.24	-0.046	0.003	1
NGC 6342	-0.66	-0.102	0.003	1
Terzan 2	-0.47	-0.107	0.006	2
NGC 6380	-0.99	-0.094	0.003	1
Palomar 6	-0.8	-0.075	0.004	3
NGC 6440	-0.26	-0.093	0.005	1
NGC 6441	-0.53	-0.092	0.005	1
NGC 6528	+0.12	-0.114	0.002	1
NGC 6553	-0.29	-0.092	0.002	1
NGC 6624	-0.35	-0.100	0.005	4
NGC 6637 (M69)	-0.59	-0.092	0.002	1
NGC 6712	-1.01	-0.091	0.006	2
NGC 6752	-1.54	-0.048	0.003	1
NGC 6809 (M55)	-1.82	-0.049	0.003	1
NGC 6838 (M71)	-0.58	-0.110	0.008	2
NGC 7078 (M15)	-2.15	-0.044	0.003	1
NGC 7099 (M30)	-2.13	-0.044	0.004	1

^a $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ values are from Zinn (1985), except for that of Palomar 6, which is taken from Lee et al. (2004).

^b(1) Valenti et al. (2004a); (2) Kuchinski et al. (1995); (3) Lee & Carney (2002); (4) Kuchinski & Frogel (1995)

Table 3. Mean Magnitudes and Colors of Clusters' Red Horizontal Branches or Red Clumps

Cluster	$E(B - V)$	[Fe/H]	σ	log age	$M_K(\text{RHB})$	σ	$\langle (J - K) \rangle_0^a$	σ
Old Open Clusters ^b								
Be 39	0.11	-0.18	0.03	9.88	-1.64	0.12	0.605	0.02
M67	0.04	0.000	0.09	9.60	-1.71	0.108	0.600	0.01
NGC 6819	0.16	0.07	0.04	9.42	-1.69	0.136	0.56	0.02
Globular Clusters ^b								
47 Tuc	0.04	-0.70	0.07	10.08	-1.364	0.211	0.50	0.02
Globular Clusters ^c								
NGC 362	0.05	-1.15	0.06	10.08	-0.83	0.241	0.39	0.04
NGC 5927	0.45	-0.31	0.1	10.08	-1.28	0.2	0.49	0.02
NGC 6624	0.25	-0.37	0.10	10.08	-1.17	0.2	0.50	0.02
NGC 6637	0.18	-0.59	0.10	10.08	-1.18	0.2	0.49	0.02
NGC 6712	0.39	-1.01	0.10	10.08	-1.16	0.2	0.44	0.02
NGC 6838	0.27	-0.58	0.10	10.08	-1.03	0.2	0.47	0.02

^aAll photometry is given in the CIT system^bFrom Kuchinski & Frogel (1995)^cFrom Grocholski & Sarajedini (2002)

REFERENCES

- Alonso, A., Arribas, S., & Martinez-Roger, C. 1996, *A&A*, 313, 873
- Alonso, A., Arribas, S., & Martinez-Roger, C. 1999, *A&AS*, 140, 261
- Alves, D. 2000, *ApJ*, 539, 732
- Bergbusch, P. A., & Vandenberg, D. A. 2001, *ApJ*, 556, 322
- Bessell, M. S., & Brett, J. M. 1988 *PASP*, 100, 1134
- Brown, J. A., Wallerstein, G., & Zucker, D. 1997, *AJ*, 114, 180
- Carney, B. W., Wright, J. S., Sneden, C., Laird, J. B., Aguilar, L. A., & Latham, D. W. 1997, *AJ*, 114, 363
- Carpenter, J. M. 2001, *AJ*, 121, 2851
- Carretta, E., & Gratton, R. F. 1997, *A&AS*, 121, 95
- Casali, M. M., & Hawarden, T. G. 1992, *JCMT-UKIRT Newsletters*, 4, 33
- Chaboyer, B., Green, E. M., & Liebert, J. 1999, *AJ*, 117, 1360
- Cohen, J. G. 2004, *AJ*, 127, 1545
- Cole, A. A., Smecker-Hane, T. A., Tolstoy, E., Bosler, T. L., & Gallagher, J. S. 2004, *MNRAS*, 347, 367
- Ferraro, F. R., Montegriffo, P., Origlia, L., Fusi Pecci, F. 2000, *AJ*, 119, 1282
- Friel, E. D., & Janes, K. A. 1993, *A&A*, 267, 75
- Friel, E. D., Janes, K. A., Tavaréz, M., Scott, J., Katsanis, R., Lotz, J., Hong, L., & Miller, N. 2002, *AJ*, 124, 2693
- Frogel, J. A., Persson, S. E., & Cohen, J. G. 1979, *ApJ*, 227, 499
- Frogel, J. A., Persson, S. E., & Cohen, J. G. 1981, *ApJ*, 246, 842
- Frogel, J. A., Persson, S. E., & Cohen, J. G. 1983, *ApJS*, 53, 713
- Grocholski, A. J., & Sarajedini, A. 2002, *AJ*, 123, 1603
- Harris, W. E. 1996, *AJ*, 112, 1487
- Ivanov, V. D., & Borissova, J. 2002, *A&A*, 390, 937
- King, J. R. 1997, *AJ*, 113, 2302
- Kuchinski, L. E., & Frogel, J. A., Persson, S. E. 1995, *AJ*, 110, 2844
- Kuchinski, L. E., Frogel, J. A., Terndrup, D. M., & Persson, S. E. 1995, *AJ*, 109, 1131
- Lee, J.-W., & Carney, B. W. 2002, *AJ*, 123, 3305

- Lee, J.-W., Carney, B. W., & Balachandran, S. 2004, *AJ*, in press
- McWilliam, A., & Rich, R. M. 1994, *ApJS*, 91, 749
- Nissen, P. E., & Schuster, W. J. 1997, *A&A*, 326, 751
- Peterson, R. C., & Green, E. M. 1998, *ApJ*, 502, L39
- Pietrzynński, G., Gieren, W., & Udalski, A. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 2494
- Rieke, G. H., & Lebofsky, M. J. 1985, *ApJ*, 288, 618
- Salaris, M., Chieffi, A., & Straniero, O. 1993, *Mem. Soc. Astron. Italiana*, 63, 315
- Sarajedini, A. 1994, *AJ*, 107, 618
- Sarajedini, A., & Layden, A. 1997, *AJ*, 113, 264
- Shetrone, M. D., Côté, P., & Sargent, W. L. W. 2001, *ApJ*, 548, 592
- Shetrone, M. D., Venn, K. A., Tolstoy, E., Primus, F., Hill, V., & Kaufer, A. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 684
- Stetson, P. B. 1987, *PASP*, 99, 191
- Stetson, P. B. 1990, *PASP*, 102, 932
- Stetson, P. B. 1994, *PASP*, 106, 250
- Stetson, P. B. 1995, *DAOPHOTII User's Manual* (Victoria: Dominion Astrophysical Observatory)
- Stetson, P. B., Bruntt, H., & Grundahl, F. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 413 (SBG2003)
- Straniero, O., & Chieffi, A. 1991, *ApJS*, 76, 911
- Taylor, B. J. 2001, *A&A*, 377, 473
- Tripicco, M. J., Bell, R. A., Dorman, B., & Hufnagel, B. 1995, *AJ*, 109, 1697
- Turner, A. M. 1995, *Cooking with ALLFRAME* (Victoria: Dominion Astrophysical Observatory)
- Twarog, B. A., Ashman, K. M., & Anthony-Twarog, B. J. 1997, *AJ*, 114, 2556
- Valenti, E., Ferraro, F. R., & Origlia, L. 2004a, *MNRAS*, 351, 1204 (VFO)
- Valenti, E., Ferraro, F. R., Perina, S., & Origlia, L. 2004b, *A&A*, 418, 139
- Worthey, G., & Jowett, K. J. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 96
- Yi, S., Demarque, P., & Kim, Y.-C. 1997, *ApJ*, 482, 677
- Yi, S., Demarque, P., Lee, Y.-W. Kim, Y.-C. Ree, C. -H., Lejeune, T., & Barnes, S. 2001, *ApJS*, 136, 417

Yi, S., Kim, Y.-C., & Demarque, P. 2003, ApJS, 144, 259

Zinn, R. 1985, ApJ, 293, 424

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1.— The K vs. $J - K$ diagram resulting from our observations. The photometry is on the “CIT” photometric system.

Fig. 2.— The differences between our K magnitude results minus those from the 2MASS survey, after transformation to the CIT photometric system. Only stars with highest quality photometry and in a limited range of K magnitudes are shown.

Fig. 3.— The differences between our $J - K$ results minus those from the 2MASS survey, after transformation to the CIT photometric system. Only stars with highest quality photometry and in a limited range of K magnitudes are shown.

Fig. 4.— The differences between our $H - K$ results minus those from the 2MASS survey, after transformation to the CIT photometric system. Only stars with highest quality photometry and in a limited range of K magnitudes are shown.

Fig. 5.— The relation between the slope of the red giant branch, $\Delta(J - K)/\Delta K$, as a function of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ for globular clusters. Data for the calibrating clusters are given in Table 2.

Fig. 6.— The results of our photometry, with red giant branch members (filled circles) and red horizontal branch members (open circles) identified. The solid line is the ordinary least squares bisector measurement of the slope of the red giant branch, while the dashed line represents the expected slope for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.3$, adopting the calibrations discussed in the text. The two lines have been adjusted to intersect at the magnitude level of the red horizontal branch.

Fig. 7.— The color-magnitude diagram for the “field” around NGC 6791, taken from the 2MASS survey. Four separation regions were used to provide the field background sample. Each region has a radius of $3'$, and each is centered $15'$ away from the cluster center along north, south, east, and west directions.

Fig. 8.— The color-magnitude diagram of NGC 6791 obtained using 2MASS data. In this case, the stars were selected to lie within $3'$ of the cluster center. The filled circles represent stars used to measure the slope of the red giant branch, indicated by the solid line, using an ordinary least squares bisector analysis.

Fig. 9.— The color-magnitude diagram of NGC 6791 obtained using 2MASS data. In this case, the stars were selected to lie within $4'$ of the cluster center. The filled circles represent stars used to measure the slope of the red giant branch, indicated by the solid line, using an

ordinary least squares bisector analysis.

Fig. 10.— Theoretical isochrones of M_K vs. $J - K$ from YKD2003. Note that the color and slope of the red giant branch are sensitive to $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$, but that the slope is *not* linear.

Fig. 11.— The color-magnitude diagram of Be 39, obtain from the 2MASS database, and restricted a region within $10'$ of the cluster's center. The stars we identify as red horizontal branch or red clump stars are indicated as open circles.

Fig. 12.— The color-magnitude diagram of NGC 6819, obtain from the 2MASS database, and restricted a region within $5'$ of the cluster's center. The stars we identify as red horizontal branch or red clump stars are indicated as open circles.

Fig. 13.— The de-reddened mean $J - K$ colors (in the CIT photometric system) of the red horizontal branch stars in the oldest open clusters and globular clusters.

Fig. 14.— The combined optical and infrared photometry for stars in our observing program, after outliers in the $J - K$ vs. $V - K$ diagram have been removed. Here we compare an infrared magnitude and an optical-infrared color. Notice that the shape of the red giant branch is distinctly curved compared to Figure 1.

Fig. 15.— The combined optical and infrared photometry for stars in our observing program, after outliers in the $J - K$ vs. $V - K$ diagram have been removed. Here we compare an optical magnitude and an optical-infrared color. Notice that the shape of the red giant branch is distinctly curved even more than in Figure 1 or Figure 14.

Fig. 16.— Here we show a comparison between model isochrones taken from YKD2003 and the optical and infrared photometry. We first identify an optimum match in V vs. $B - V$, using the optical photometry of SBG2003. In this case we found a good match for $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = 0.0$, $[\alpha/\text{Fe}] = 0.0$, $E(B - V) = 0.26$ mag, a distance modulus of 12.73 mag, and an age of 8 Gyrs. However, the infrared color-magnitude diagrams do not agree well at all, implying significant errors in the reddening, hence distance, or in the metallicity.

Fig. 17.— We repeat the comparisons of Figure 16, but using $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.3$ and $[\alpha/\text{Fe}] = 0.0$. Here the optimal fit to the optical data suggests $E(B - V) = 0.17$ mag, $(m - M)_0 = 12.93$ mag, and, again, an age of 8 Gyrs.

Fig. 18.— We repeat the comparisons of Figure 16, but using $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.4$ and $[\alpha/\text{Fe}] = 0.0$. Here the optimal fit to the optical data suggests $E(B - V) = 0.13$ mag, $(m - M)_0 =$

12.96 mag, and, again, an age of 8 Gyrs.

Fig. 19.— We repeat the comparisons of Figure 16, but using $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = +0.5$ and $[\alpha/\text{Fe}] = 0.0$. Here the optimal fit to the optical data suggests $E(B - V) = 0.11$ mag, $(m - M)_0 = 13.15$ mag, and an age of 7.5 Gyrs.





































